

No. 3, Vol. VI.—Quarterly.

JULY, 1880.

# THE ARMOURY

A  
MAGAZINE OF WEAPONS

FOR  
CHRISTIAN

PUT ON  
THE WHOLE  
ARMOUR OF  
GOD THAT  
YE MAY BE

ABLE TO  
STAND  
AGAINST  
THE WILES OF  
THE DEVIL  
EPH. VI. II.

WARFARE

## CONTENTS

THE EFFORTS OF THE PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE.

ROMAN CATHOLIC APPOINTMENTS.

GREAT MEETING IN LONDON.

IS ENGLAND TO REMAIN A PROTESTANT KINGDOM ?

THE PRINCIPLES OF ROMANISM, IN REFERENCE TO THE RECENT POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
SE 80  
CAMBRIDGE

S. W. PARTRIDGE & Co.  
9. PATERNOSTER ROW. LONDON.

PRICE TWO PENCE.

PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE, 38, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

# PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE,

WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED

THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION, Established 1835.

For establishing PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL CLASSES, and by Popular Lectures, Protestant Literature, and otherwise instructing the People in the Principles and History of the Reformation; for defending our Protestant Constitution and Institutions; and for opposing Papal Aggression throughout the Empire.

Secretary—REV. G. E. BADENOCH, LL.D.

Offices—88, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.,

(A few doors from the House of Commons).

Contributions received from 13th March, 1860, to 15th June, 1860.

	£	s.	d.	Special Parliamentary Efforts, continued—	£	s.	d.	Special Parliamentary Efforts, continued—	£	s.	d.
Bayley, W. H. ...	1	0	0	Crampton, Miss (per	30	0	0	Martin, J. O. ...	0	10	0
Bell, Dr. ...	0	10	0	Rev. W. Baker, B.D.)	10	0	0	Money, W. R. ...	0	10	0
Ellerton, Miss ...	0	10	0	Cankrien, Miss ...	5	0	0	Mills, Rev. J. ...	0	5	0
Fortescue, J. F. ...	3	5	6	Cowgill, Misses ...	2	0	0	Nash, Rev. E. ...	1	0	0
Frederick, Mrs. ...	1	1	0	Cave-Brown, Miss ...	1	1	0	Pollitt, Mrs. ...	2	0	0
Gwynne, Dr. W. G. ...	0	10	0	Chippendale, Misses ...	1	0	0	Fritt, Mrs. ...	1	1	0
Hall Houghton, Rev. H. ...	1	1	0	Christie, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Faler, Rev. T. ...	1	0	0
H. S. ...	1	1	0	Cumberlege, Miss ...	1	0	0	Farker, W. ...	0	10	0
Hull Protestant Insti-	3	2	0	Clarke, J. ...	0	10	0	Peck, Miss E. ...	0	5	0
tute, Armoury ...	0	10	0	Cooper, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Post Mark, London ...	0	5	0
Henderson, Miss ...	0	10	0	Cooper, W. ...	0	10	0	Andrews ...	0	4	0
Hamilton, Mrs. de	0	6	0	Collyer, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Rawlins, Col. ...	1	0	0
Courcy ...	0	6	0	Oswens, Mrs. ...	0	5	0	Rogers, Rev. F. ...	1	0	0
J. A. S. ...	5	0	0	Dale, T. B. ...	60	0	0	Rodwell, H. ...	0	4	0
Jelf, Mrs., 1879-80	1	1	0	Danbury, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Somes, Mrs. ...	10	0	0
King, the Hon. Mrs.	10	0	0	Davies, Rev. E. ...	0	10	0	Spitta, Rev. F. J. ...	5	0	0
Locke, ...	2	2	0	Elberby, Mrs. ...	5	0	0	Soutter, Dr., M.C. ...	2	0	0
Kendra, C. ...	0	5	0	Ellis, W. R. ...	1	0	0	Steele, J. ...	2	0	0
Llewelyn, J. G. ...	1	0	0	Estough, J. ...	1	0	0	Stuart, A. M. ...	2	0	0
Leander, H. ...	0	10	0	Edlin, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Standers, Miss ...	1	1	0
Loveland, Miss ...	0	1	0	Fremlin, Messrs. ...	3	3	0	Stewart, H. C. ...	0	10	0
Maitland, R. S. ...	0	10	0	Farington, Miss ...	1	10	0	Shadwell, T. M. ...	0	10	0
Robinson, W. ...	31	0	0	Garnett, Mrs. ...	3	0	0	Tattersall, J. ...	5	5	0
Roberts, Messrs. ...	2	2	0	Gardiner, Rev. G. G. ...	1	2	0	Trokes, G. H. ...	2	0	0
Robertson, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Grave, Miss ...	0	10	0	Thursfield, Rev. E. ...	1	0	0
R. M. S. ...	5	0	0	Gathorne, Misses ...	0	5	0	Taylor, Rev. C. J. ...	0	10	0
Sale, G. J. ...	2	3	0	Howden, Dr. ...	2	2	0	Veau, Rev. J. ...	1	0	0
Stuart, H. C. ...	3	0	0	Hanson, E. ...	3	3	0	Valpy, Rev. F. ...	0	5	0
Somes, Mrs. ...	2	0	0	Hooper, C. H. ...	2	0	0	Wade, Misses ...	2	0	0
Saunders, Mrs. ...	1	1	0	Hooper, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Wright, Messrs ...	3	0	0
Soulby, Dr. ...	0	10	0	Hadow, Miss ...	1	0	0	Wright, Misses ...	2	0	0
Vincent, J. ...	2	0	0	Harrison, Mrs. Barker	1	1	0	Wright, J. Kennedy ...	1	0	0
Special Parliamentary Efforts:—				Handcock, Rev. W. F. ...	1	0	0	Wright, M. ...	2	2	0
A Friend ...	180	0	0	Henderson, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Workman, Dr. ...	0	10	0
A Friend ...	2	0	0	Harrison, W. B. ...	0	10	0				
Atkinson, Miss ...	0	5	0	Hobson, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Collected by Mr. T. O. Smith:—			
Brathwaite, L. ...	10	0	0	Hinton, T. C. ...	3	0	0	Astle, E. B. ...	0	10	0
Willet, Rev. G. ...	5	0	0	Isacs, Mrs. ...	0	10	0	Abraham, E. and Son ...	0	2	0
Babington, Rev. ...	2	0	0	James, Misses ...	0	10	0	Atkins, Mr. ...	0	2	0
Boncompagni, Miss ...	2	0	0	Jacob, J. ...	0	10	0	Alcock, F. ...	0	10	0
Burrows, T. C. ...	1	19	0	Kennedy, Mrs. ...	2	0	0	Andrews, J. ...	0	10	0
Bishop, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Killick, Misses ...	0	7	0	Andrews, G. J. ...	0	5	0
Boobyer, J. ...	1	0	0	Longueville, T. L. ...	1	0	0	Adams, G. ...	0	5	0
Bovill, Miss ...	1	0	0	Lywood, J. ...	0	10	0	Andrews, G. ...	0	5	0
Badcock, Miss ...	1	0	0	Lambert, R. ...	0	2	0	Aldwell, Rev. E. D. ...	1	0	0
Brathwaite, Rev. E. ...	1	0	0	Martin, Lady ...	5	0	0	Atkins, Miss ...	0	10	0
				Maitland, E. B. ...	2	2	0	Barker, Miss ...	0	5	0
				Naberley, G. ...	2	2	0	Barnard, E. ...	0	5	0

# THE ARMOURY.

---

## The Efforts of the Protestant Educational Institute.

### GENERAL ELECTION.

While prosecuting the establishment of Protestant classes to the utmost of the means placed at the disposal of the Institute, it has also exerted itself in opposing all bills introduced into Parliament whose tendency is to undermine our Protestant Constitution. It also resolved to put forth special efforts for enlightening public opinion during the recent general election. With this view it appealed to its friends for special help for carrying out this object. The result of that appeal was to place at its disposal about £320. During the general election, therefore, packets of Protestant literature were distributed in almost every constituency throughout England, to the amount of upwards of eighty thousand tracts, pamphlets, and leaflets.

### PROTESTANT CLASSES.

The following Protestant classes have also been carried on, and examinations held, since our last report:—Funds are earnestly requested for this important branch of the operations of the Institute.

### WORKING ORPHAN SCHOOL,

Haverstock Hill, London, N.W.

The Rev. Dr. Maguire delivered a course of lectures on the "Martyrs and Reformers of the Church" to the scholars of this large and important institution. A written examination was held, and about fifty prizes were presented to successful competitors. The examination gave great satisfaction to the adjudicator and to the directors of the institution.

### DEVONPORT.

This class was resumed by Lieutenant Street during the past winter, on the doctrines of the Church of Rome.

### HOLLOWAY.

The Rev. James Forsyth, minister of Caledonian Church, has also resumed his class for the members of his congregation.

## BECKENHAM.

The Rev. Alexander King has delivered a course of lectures in the Mission Hall, Christ Church, Beckenham. An examination was held and prizes distributed at a public meeting; Dr. Jardine in the chair. The first prize was awarded to Mary A. Stoneham; second, Jesse Scholefield; third, Emily Mary Dennis; fourth, Elizabeth E. Burnett.

## WARWICK.

The Rev. John Gibson, Congregational minister, continued his Protestant class. The following obtained prizes:—The first four are Sabbath school teachers, the fifth a Primitive Methodist, the sixth a Baptist. The names are (1) Henry G. Payton, (2) Janet Moffat, (3) Henry Buckley, (4) Henry Hinkley, (5) Mary Ann Jackson, (6) Thomas Lester.

## BARNET.

A class was conducted by Mr. James Fodd, examiner of the Protestant Educational Institute in connection with that Institute and the Young Men's Christian Association of Barnet and the Finchley Protestant Association for the northern suburbs of London. A written examination was held, and the following obtained prizes:—First, Emily A. Ranken; second, Walter H. S. Ranken; third, E. Nunneley; fourth, Mary C. Abbott; fifth, Rose A Wynne, sixth, Agnes Abbott.

## Roman Catholic Appointments.

The country was taken by surprise by Mr. Gladstone appointing a Roman Catholic, Lord O'Hagan, as Lord Chancellor of Ireland. But a special Act of Parliament, passed by Mr. Gladstone's former Government, opened the way for such an appointment. Lord O'Hagan under that Act occupied before that office. He was the first Roman Catholic who had been elevated to the Irish Lord Chancellorship since the Reformation. Many had forgotten this, and the appointment might have been expected. It is, however, highly inexpedient and is a pregnant illustration of how the Protestant principles of the Constitution are being sapped and destroyed. The appointment of Lord Kenmare, another Roman Catholic, as Lord Chamberlain, and of Lord Ripon, Viceroy of India, is the most audacious yet made by a Prime Minister, in the teeth of the Act of Settlement and the other laws of the realm. Mr. Gladstone has endeavoured to justify these appointments in a letter from his secretary, Mr. Godley, to Lord Oranmore, in reply to a protest against the appointment by the British Reformation Society, and also in a similar answer sent to the memorial of the Scottish Reformation Society.—Mr. Gladstone in these communications said:—"The qualifications of Lord Ripon for the high office of

Viceroy of India had been carefully considered by Her Majesty's Government. That Her Majesty's Government repose a particular confidence in the honour, and impartiality of Lord Ripon, and that they are convinced, from long experience of his personal qualities, that he would never allow his own religious leanings or profession to interfere with the perfect equity of his conduct in any case where religious interests might be concerned. I am desired to add that the office of Viceroy is one detached in a remarkable degree from all direct contact with religious and ecclesiastical interest, and that in the case of the Lord Chamberlain's office, Lord Kenmare, as had been publicly stated, has by a voluntary arrangement divested himself of all functions bearing upon ecclesiastical matters."

Dr. Badenoch, in reply, addressed the following letter to the Editor of *The Record* :—

The Protestant Educational Institute,

38, Parliament-street.

Sir,—I wish to draw your attention to two statements contained in the letter of Mr. Godley, written by direction of Mr. Gladstone to Lord Oranmore, with regard to the appointments of Lord Kenmare and Lord Ripon. It is said that Lord Kenmare "has, by a voluntary arrangement, divested himself of all functions bearing upon ecclesiastical matters." It is somewhat strange that a nobleman should accept an office and then divest himself of a part of its functions. It is stranger still that this should be done by a voluntary arrangement, since there is an Act of Parliament forbidding him, a Roman Catholic, to discharge any function bearing upon "ecclesiastical matter" in connexion with the Church of England. No doubt the Act to which I refer is well known to Mr. Gladstone, because it is said in the same communication that the appointment of Lord Ripon was "well-considered." Is it too much to assume that Lord Kenmare was also aware of this Act of Parliament? At all events, it is right that the law should be known, and if you will allow me I shall quote the section of the Act to which I refer. It is found in what is called the "Roman Catholic Relief Act" (10 George IV., cap. vii., section 18), and is as follows :—

"And be it enacted, that it shall not be lawful for any person professing the Roman Catholic religion, directly or indirectly, to advise His Majesty, his heirs or successors, or any person or persons holding or exercising the office of Guardian of the United Kingdom, or of Regent of the United Kingdom, under whatever name, style, or title such office may be constituted, or the Lord-Lieutenant, or Lord-Deputy, or other chief governor or governors of Ireland, touching or concerning the appointment to, or disposal of, any office or preferment in the United Church of England and Ireland, or in the Church of Scotland; and if any such person shall offend in the premises, he shall, being thereof convicted by due course of law, be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanour, and disabled for ever from holding any office, civil or military, under the Crown."

It will thus be seen that if Lord Kenmare had attempted to interfere with the appointment of Royal Chaplains or Lent Preachers, he would have been guilty of a "high misdemeanour," and disabled for ever from holding any office, civil or military, under the Crown. It is, moreover, an act of great audacity on the part of a Prime Minister to place a nobleman in such a position, that if he discharge all the functions of the office he would be acting contrary to law.

In reference to the appointment of Lord Ripon the same law applies. There is a further clause in this Act of Parliament which may fairly be held to condemn the appointment. The clause is as follows :—

#### Sec. XII.

"Provided also, and be it further enacted, that nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to enable any person or persons professing the Roman Catholic religion to hold or exercise the office of Guardians and Justices of the United Kingdom, or of Regent of the United Kingdom, under whatever name, style, or title such office may be constituted; nor to enable any person, otherwise than as he is now by law enabled to hold or enjoy the office of Lord High Chancellor, Lord Keeper or Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal of Great Britain or Ireland, or the office of Lord-Lieutenant or Lord-Deputy, or other chief governor or governors of Ireland, or His Majesty's High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland."

No doubt the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland has since been opened to a Roman Catholic and is at the present moment held by Lord O'Hagan. But the offices still preserved establish the argument that the representative of a Protestant Sovereign should not be a Roman Catholic. It is absurd for Mr. Gladstone to say that Lord Ripon "will never allow his own religious leanings or professions to interfere with the perfect equity of his conduct in any case where religious interests might be concerned." For this would be contrary to the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, and would violate his conscience as a Roman Catholic. And if he does interfere with Protestant chaplains it is difficult to see how he can evade the section of the Act which I have already quoted charging him as being guilty of a high misdemeanour, and disabling him for ever after holding any office, civil or military. This argument is further strengthened by the Coronation Oath and by the "Bill of Rights" and Act of Settlement limiting the throne to a Protestant. It may be useful at the present time to give the section of the "Bill of Rights," and also of the Article of the Treaty of Union with Scotland bearing on this point. Let me premise that the discussion in Parliament in reference to "The Grand Remonstrance" of 1641, and which ultimately resulted in the "Bill of Rights," and the "Act of Settlement," turned chiefly on this question. The great statesman, Pym, expressed it in this way: he wished the Roman Catholics no harm, but "he wished they might



be kept in such a condition as should restrain them from doing hurt. The principles of Popery are such as are incompatible with any other religion. Laws will not restrain them. Oaths will not. The Pope can dispense with both these, and where there is occasion his command will move them to the disturbance of the realm against their own private position—yea, against their own reason and judgment—not only in spiritual matters, but in temporal." No one can deny that this opinion is as correct now as it was in the time of Pym; and moreover it shows, as well as "Vaticanism," the absurdity of Mr. Gladstone's present assertion. The Parliament of England found by bitter experience that Pym was right, and hence, in 1688, the following clause was adopted in the "Bill of Rights":—

"And whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince, or by any King or Queen marrying a Papist, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do further pray that it may be enacted that all and every person and persons that is, are, or shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of this realm, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such case or cases the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall from time to time descend to, and be enjoyed by, such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead. And that every King and Queen of this realm who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the Imperial Crown of this kingdom shall, on the first day of the meeting of the first Parliament next after his or her coming to the Crown, sitting in his or her throne in the House of Peers, in the presence of the Lords and Commons therein assembled, or at his or her coronation before such person or persons who shall administer the Coronation Oath to him or her, at the time of his or her taking the said oath (which shall first happen), adhere, subscribe, and audibly repeat the declaration mentioned in the statute made in the 18th year of the reign of King Charles II., intituled, 'An Act for the more effectual preserving the King's person and Government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament.'"

And when the question of succession was again raised in the time of Queen Anne by the Parliament of Scotland, the principle of the "Bill of Rights" was reasserted in the Treaty of Union,

and is the foundation for the loyal allegiance of the people to their Sovereign. It is contained in the second Article, which is as follows :—

“ That the succession to the Monarchy of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and of the dominions thereto belonging, after Her Most Sacred Majesty, and in default of issue of Her Majesty, be, remain, and continue, to the most excellent Princess Sophia, Electoress, and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants, upon the Crown of England, is settled by an Act of Parliament, made in England in the twelfth year of the reign of His late Majesty King William the Third, intituled, ‘ An Act for further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject;’ and that all Papists, and persons marrying Papists, shall be excluded from, and for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy, the Imperial Crown of Great Britain, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part thereof; and, in every such case, the Crown and Government shall, from time to time, descend to, and be enjoyed by, such person, being a Protestant, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same, in case such Papist, or person marrying a Papist, was naturally dead, according to provision for the descent of the Crown of England, made by another Act of Parliament, in the first year of the reign of their late Majesties King William and Queen Mary, intituled, ‘ An Act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject, and settling the succession of the Crown.’ ”

How far the Voluntarism of Scotland or the “ Liberation theory ” of the Nonconformists of England will stand the present test, time will show. But I hope that the dangers with which we are now threatened will open the eyes of all loyal and patriotic men, and, irrespective of churches or political parties, they will combine together to defend and maintain the Protestant principles of our Constitution, and show to the countries of Europe, and to India and our colonies, that we are still a “ Protestant kingdom.”

P.S.—Since writing the above Lord Hartington, in the House of Commons, has replied to a question put by Colonel Barne, that, in reference to “ Protestant bishops and clergy in India, certain directions or orders may have to be given by the Government, but those orders could not be given by the Governor-General, but by the Governor-General in Council.” This distinction is of no avail in the face of a distinct provision in the Act of 1829. I venture to submit that the “ Governor-General in Council,” even in his official capacity, comes under the liability of committing a high misdemeanour; the more so as it is done in his official capacity and as the representative of Her Majesty. The Act 21 and 22 Vict. cap. 106 (2 August, 1858), transferred the Government of



India from the East India Company to Her Majesty. By that Act India "became vested in Her Majesty, and the Government to be exercised in her name." And by the more recent Act of 39 Vict. cap. 10 (27 April, 1876), authorizing the title of Empress, the preamble referring to the above Act runs thus:—"It is enacted, "that the Government of India theretofore vested in the East Indian Company, in trust for Her Majesty, should become vested in Her Majesty, and that India should henceforth be governed by and in the name of Her Majesty." It is therefore clear that the Governor-General in Council must act in the name of Her Majesty to discharge the trust vested in the Sovereign, and hence the wrong in appointing a Roman Catholic to act in the room of a Protestant Sovereign.

The following is the Coronation Oath as enacted by stat. 1 William and Mary, sess. 1, c. 6, A.D. 1688. (o.s.):—

"Whereas, by the law and ancient usage of this realm, the kings and queens thereof have taken a solemn oath upon the Evangelists at their respective coronations, to maintain the statutes, laws, and customs of the said realm, and all the people and inhabitants thereof in their spiritual and civil rights and properties; but forasmuch as the oath itself on such occasion administered, hath heretofore been framed in doubtful words and expressions, with relation to ancient laws and constitutions at this time unknown. To the end, therefore that one uniform oath may be in all times to come taken by the kings and queens of this realm, and to them respectively administered at the times of their and every of their coronation; may it please your Majesties that it may be enacted:—

"2. And be it enacted by the King's and Queen's Most Excellent Majesties, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the Oath herein mentioned, and hereafter expressed, shall and may be administered to their Most Excellent Majesties King William and Queen Mary (whom God long preserve), at the time of their coronation, in the presence of all persons that shall be then and there present at the solemnizing thereof, by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Archbishop of York, or either of them, or any other Bishop of this realm whom the King's Majesty shall thereunto appoint, and who shall be hereby thereunto respectfully authorized; which Oath followeth, and shall be administered in this manner; that is to say,—

"3. *The Archbishop or Bishop shall say*,—"Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this kingdom of England and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the same?"

"*The King and Queen shall say*,—"I solemnly promise so to do.

"*Archbishop or Bishop*.—"Will you to the utmost of your power cause law and justice in mercy to be executed in all your judgments?"

"*King and Queen.*—'I will.'

"*Archbishop or Bishop.*—'Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges, as by law do or shall appertain unto them or any of them?'

"*King and Queen.*—'All this I promise to do.'

"After this the King and Queen, laying his and her hand upon the Holy Gospels, shall say,—

"*King and Queen.*—'The things which I have herebefore promised I will perform and keep; so help me God.'

"Then the King and Queen shall kiss the book.

"4. And be it further enacted that the said oath shall be in like manner administered to every King or Queen who shall succeed to the imperial crown of this realm, at their respective coronations, by one of the archbishops or bishops of this realm of England, for the time being, to be thereunto appointed by such King or Queen respectively, and in the presence of all persons that shall be attending, assisting, or otherwise present at such their respective coronation; any law, statute, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding."

The following is the *Declaration against Transubstantiation* enacted by Sec. 2 of the 12 and 13 W. III., c. 12, commonly called the Act of Settlement, re-enacting s. 10 of Stat. 1 W. and M. Sess. 2, c. 2, commonly called the Bill of Rights, provides that every King and Queen of the realm of the age of twelve years shall make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the following declaration mentioned in the 30th of King Charles II., St. 2:—

"I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe, that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, ARE SUPERSTITIOUS AND IDOLATROUS. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved from this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

The Postmaster-General (Mr. Fawcett) has also endeavoured to justify the appointments of Lord Kenmare and Lord Ripon at a soiree which took place in the Town Hall, Shoreditch. In addressing his constituents he is reported to have expressed his approval on the ground of "complete religious toleration." (See *Daily News*, 16 June, 1880.)

Dr. Badenoch, in reply to this assertion, addressed the following communication to Mr. Fawcett :—

Protestant Educational Institute,  
38, Parliament-street,  
16 June, 1880.

Sir,—In the report of your speech in the *Daily News* of this morning, at the Shoreditch Town Hall, you are reported to justify the appointment of Lord Ripon, a Roman Catholic, as Viceroy of India, on the ground of "religious toleration." But I venture to remind you of the sound axiom of some of our ablest statesmen, that it is a political blunder, and perilous to civil order to tolerate intolerance. I venture also to remind you that the objection is not to the character of the individual but to the principles of the religious persuasion, which he is bound to believe and to carry out. One of these principles is, that the Pope of Rome, as Vicar of Christ, is above all civil Governments and Acts of Parliament. In short, a Roman Catholic *first* and an Englishman afterwards. In order that you may see the principles of the system bearing on civil polity stated shortly, I enclose a publication \* written by one of the most eminent canonists in Germany—a Roman Catholic: I refer you to the propositions laid down and proved from page 19. The history of this translation is in itself an illustration of intolerance. When it became known who the translator was, likewise a Roman Catholic, he was ruined by his own priests and obliged to abandon his profession and to emigrate to America.

Moreover, I beg to express the opinion that this appointment violates the statute law of England, and cannot be justified so long as the throne is limited to a Protestant.—I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

G. R. BADENOCH.

In order that our readers may see that the Pope is prepared to take every advantage of the appointment of Lord Ripon to the Viceroyalty of India, we think it right to transfer the following communication from the correspondent of *The Standard* newspaper at Rome, dated 8th June :—

"I have already told you that very great satisfaction has been expressed at the Vatican at the appointment of Lord Ripon. It is observed there that the numerous Catholic missions existing in

\* The Power of the Roman Popes, &c., by Dr. J. F. Von Schuttle, and translated from the German.—Protestant Educational Institute, 38, Parliament-street, S.W.

India give a great importance to Catholic interests in that country, and much is hoped in regard to their extension in power, number, and influence from the appointment in question. Remarks to the above effect have not only suggested themselves to the rulers of the Apostolic Court generally, but have been made by the Pontiff himself, who takes the greatest interest in all that tends to the possible extension of the Catholic Church in countries beyond the present pale of Christendom. So much so that the Holy Father and his most trusted advisers are now busy with devising the best means of entering into communication with the new governor, with a view to placing under his special protection the Catholic mission and the interests of the Catholics generally in India."

### Great Meeting in London.

By the efforts of Mr. James Bateman and Dr. Badenoch, a preliminary meeting was held in the drawing-room of the National Club, to confer as to the best means of protesting against the appointment of Lord Ripon. At this meeting, which was largely attended, Archdeacon Hunter was called to the chair. Resolutions were unanimously passed that an effort should be made to obtain the co-operation of the various missionary and Protestant societies in London to organize a public meeting to protest against the appointment. A large committee was formed to carry out this object, and communications were immediately addressed to all the Protestant Societies to carry out this object. Arrangements were accordingly made chiefly by the Protestant Alliance, the Protestant Educational Institute, and the Church Association, to hold a public meeting in Exeter Hall, on Friday, 18th June. Great care was taken to issue tickets to those only who sympathized with the object of the meeting; but we are informed that tickets were forged by Roman Catholics in order to gain admission and to disturb the unanimity of the meeting. The meeting was crowded by a most intelligent audience, and notwithstanding the interruptions by Roman Catholics, the meeting was highly successful. We append an abridged report of the proceedings.\*

Mr. J. D. Allcroft presided, and the following gentlemen among many others were present—Ven. Archdeacon Hunter, Sir A. Cotton, K.C.S.I., Sir Geo. Lawrence, K.C.S.I., C.B., General Wilkinson, S. Brook, Esq., Controller P. W., Madras, A. M. Stewart, Esq., and W. C. Maughan, Esq., of Glasgow, Rev. Joseph Bardale, Rev. Dr. Verner White, Rev. Richard Roberts, of Liverpool, Sir R. W. Carden, M.P., C. N. Newdegate, Esq., M.P., W. Henty, Esq., H. J. Atkinson, Esq., Ven. Archdeacon Whateley, Rev. S. D. C. Douglas, Rev. F. L. West, Jas. Bateman, Esq., F.R.S., Lord Oranmore and Browne, Rev. W. Phelps, Dr. Jardine, W. B. Ellis, Esq., Rev. W. R. H. Adamson, Rev. E. N. Willson, Rev. H. W. Townsend, Rev. W. Exton, Colonel Macdonald, Rev. E. D. Wickham, A. H. Guinness, Esq., Rev. Dr. Badenoch,

\* See full report in *Press and St. James's Chronicle*, 19th June; *Record*, 21st; *Rock*, 25th, 1880.

Rev. W. Baker, B.D., Rev. Canon Tugwell, Rev. Dr. Wainwright, M. F. Tupper, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S., J. W. Brooks, Esq., W. E. Shipton, Esq., F. D. Mott, Esq., Hon. H. Dudley Ryder, Major Cooper Gardiner, H. C. Stuart, Esq., Rev. J. Forsyth, J. Biller, Esq., R. Davis, Esq., Lord H. Cholmondeley, Rev. J. R. Gregg, Rev. Dr. Nolan, H. Rose, Esq., A. Suttaby, Esq., J. Hornsby Wright, Esq., Rev. J. F. Bateman, Dr. Shann, C. H. Bousfield, Esq., Rev. J. Bennett, M. Wallbrook, Esq., Rev. W. Allan, Rev. W. Frith, H. W. Sanders, Esq., E. P. Labilliere, Esq., H. C. Nisbet, Esq., Rev. J. Joyce Evans, Donald Matheson, Esq., Archibald Arroll, Esq., J.P., Glasgow, John Gadsby, Esq., Surgeon-General W. Johnston, M.D., Dr. Stanton, Cincinnati, U.S., Colonel Browne, late Bengal Staff Corps &c., &c.

Archdeacon Hunter offered up the following prayer :—

"Almighty God, who hast in all ages showed Thy power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverances of our beloved country from the wicked conspiracies and malicious practices of all the enemies thereof—in the days of our fathers of old Thou didst graciously deliver our nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power, and didst make us a Protestant kingdom to Thy praise and glory. We adore the wisdom and justice of Thy Providence, which so timely interposed in our extreme danger, and disappointed all the designs of our enemies. We beseech Thee, give us a lively and lasting sense of what Thou didst then, and hast since that time done for us, that we may not grow secure and careless. Let truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity, devotion and piety, concord and unity, with all other virtues, so flourish among us that they may be the stability of our times, and make this Protestant kingdom a praise in the earth. O Lord, be Thou still our Mighty Protector, and scatter the enemies that labour for the overthrow of our Monarchy, our Protestant Christianity, and the supreme authority of Thy Holy Word. Infatuate and defeat their counsels, abate their pride, assurge their malice and confound their devices. Strengthen the hands of our gracious Sovereign Queen Victoria, protect and defend her and all the Royal Family from all evil councillors. Thou hast graciously set her upon the Throne of her ancestors—we beseech Thee to protect her on the same from all the dangers to which she may be exposed, hide her from the gathering together of the froward, and from the insurrection of wicked doers. Do Thou weaken the hands, blast the designs, and defeat the enterprises of all her enemies, that no secret conspiracies nor open violence may disquiet her reign; but that, being safely kept under the shadow of Thy wing, and supported by Thy Power, she may triumph over all opposition, that so the world may acknowledge Thee to be her defender and mighty deliverer in all difficulties and adversities. O Heavenly Father, grant Thy blessing to this our meeting to-night—make us all of one mind, and one heart, and one soul, in entering our solemn protest against the appointment of a Roman Catholic as the representative of our Protestant Sovereign in the Government of British India. We pray that Thy righteous displeasure may not come down upon our nation for this act; but O do Thou overrule it by Thy Divine Power, and make Thy grace and love to be seen in removing from us this great calamity; grant that our Throne may still be established in righteousness, that our civil and religious liberties may be continued to us, and give us grace and strength to hand them down in all their purity and integrity to generations yet unborn. Bless those who shall speak to us to-night; grant that Thy Holy Spirit may guide and direct their thoughts and words to Thy glory, and the advancement of pure and undefiled religion in our midst; so that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessities for them, for us, and Thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen."

"Our Father." &c.

Mr. A. H. Guinness read the following letters :—

Dear Sir,—Circumstances which I cannot control will prevent me from attending the meeting on Friday; but I desire most heartily to join you in pro-

testing against the recent appointment of Roman Catholics to high and important offices in the State. I fully admit that our Protestant principles demand a very large concession of freedom for opinions with which we have no sympathy, but I cannot see that they require us to acquiesce in the promotion of men to positions for which they are notoriously disqualified by their religious convictions. I have long been convinced that an opinion expressed by Mr. Gladstone in 1874 is the simple truth—*i.e.*, "That no one can now become a convert to the Papal Church without forfeiting his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another"—another who is an alien and an avowed enemy to our Protestant institutions. Holding that opinion, I contend that no convert of the Papal Church can be duly qualified to fill a position of trust under a Protestant Sovereign. I hope you will have a good meeting, and that the recent appointments will call forth a decided expression of Protestant indignation throughout the country.—I am, faithfully yours, JAMES MADEN HOLT.

Dear Sir,—My hands are more than full, or I would attend the meeting. I think Mr. Gladstone has made a great mistake in appointing a Roman Catholic Viceroy in India. So long as the Law of Settlement is in force, it seems to me to be involved in the Protestant succession to the Throne that all Viceroys should be Protestants also. Our predecessors judged from painful experience that Papists would not allow them their liberties if they mounted the throne, and, therefore, they excluded them. I do not think that the English people are prepared to remove this safeguard, and while it remains, it seems clear to me that her Majesty's Viceroys must not be Catholics. On this and other grounds I am extremely sorry that the present Government should thus expose itself to just criticism, and grieve its own supporters.—Yours truly, C. H. SPURGEON.

Dear Sir,—Would that I could attend the meeting on the 18th inst. Since, by the proclamation of the dogma of "Infallibility" as a fundamental tenet of the Papal system, the political relation of the Papacy to Sovereigns, States, and Empires has been so seriously changed and complicated, it is to me altogether inconceivable how our Government could have committed so serious an error as to appoint a Romanist as Viceroy. By the present constitution of the Romish Church a Romanist must set the Pope up as above the Queen, temporally as well as spiritually, and though to the Papist this is perfectly natural, it is to the Protestant intolerable; and, as ours is a Protestant constitution, I am unable to see how such an appointment is at all in harmony with it.—Yours truly, CLEMENT CLEMENCE (Congregationalist).

Also letters apologising for unavoidable absence, and expressing fullest sympathy and approval had been received from many others, of various Protestant denominations.

The Chairman said: I attend here upon one distinct understanding, which was entered into and agreed to before I accepted the office of Chairman, and that was, that in no possible sense should this be considered a political meeting. (Hear, hear.) We are met here as a free and full and open gathering of British subjects, to express, without any fear, strongly our opinion that the appointment of Lord Ripon is one which is hateful to us—(loud and prolonged applause)—and which is derogatory to the Crown of these realms—(renewed applause)—and which is dishonouring to the faith of the great bulk of this nation, and which, I think, the great bulk of this nation will take as a direct insult. We meet here on an anniversary which is of very special interest to this country—the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo—(applause)—and have we not cause to thank God that He saved our country from being overriden and conquered by a Popish Emperor—(applause)—and are we after sixty years to be so weak-kneed that we will not rise up and protest against a Popish Viceroy? (Applause.) There are some who will say, "What is the harm of the Viceroy sent out to India?" (Hear, hear.) "It is not against any law of the country." When that Act (1820) was passed there was



no Viceroy of India. India was then under a Governor-General; she was not then under a direct representative of the Queen; or, if she had been, the Viceroy of India would also have been excluded from being a Roman Catholic. And when we think of this what do we feel? In this country we have clean hands in opposing this appointment, because we have civil and religious liberty, and the Roman Catholics know it, and cannot deny it. (Loud applause.) They know they have more liberty here than we have in their foreign countries, and one of the best proofs is that you will find on the judicial bench and on the magisterial bench Roman Catholics, and Jews, and others. That is the freedom of this country, and therefore we are not afraid of any cry that we are narrow-minded, or are in any way infringing the principle of civil and religious liberty. We say nothing personal to any man in this matter; we speak of the principle. God has given us that magnificent Empire of India, and has enabled us to build it up, and we have now under the control and subjection of our Sovereign some two hundred millions of subjects, who are our fellow-subjects. This country has for fifty years striven by various societies to bring the blessed Word of God into that country—(applause)—and are we to let all that labour go for nothing? (Applause.) Are we, on the other hand, to say that it is no business of ours to keep that great country? Are we not bound to bring to that country the truth of the Bible, for which it was put under our care; and, if so, can we do that through a Roman Catholic? (No, no.) You know that they will not have the Bible, and therefore we have a serious responsibility to a Higher Power than even the Queen in this matter. This great country has been put under our care and guidance for higher purposes than commerce or territory. It has been given to us that we may be the means of spreading over that country the knowledge of God's great and glorious truth. (Applause.) And if we are to be in that position, and we take that view of it, how can we expect that nation to be recovered and brought back from the worship of idols of wood and stone when we send to govern it a man who worships an image? (Thunders of applause.) To show that this is not a hole-and-corner meeting, deputations are present from Glasgow, Liverpool, Birmingham, Norwich, Dundee, Southsea, and Greenock; and meetings have been held at Bristol, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Dundee to support this meeting, as well as in many other places. Mr. Alleroff concluded by reading an extract from a letter from Bishop Ryan in which the Bishop, while expressing the deepest regret at being unable to attend the meeting, gave his strongest approval to the intended protest against the appointment of a Roman Catholic as the representative of the Protestant Sovereign of this country. (Applause.)

Mr. James Bateman, F.R.S., moved the first resolution, "That this meeting, viewing with alarm and indignation the selection of a Roman Catholic as the representative of our Sovereign in the Government of British India, emphatically protests against the appointment as inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the British Constitution, dangerous to the stability of the Throne, and inimical to our civil and religious liberty." (The resolution was received with tremendous and prolonged applause.)

Dr. White seconded the resolution. He said this was not a political meeting. He should as willingly have appeared on that platform to protest against the appointment of a Roman Catholic Viceroy in India if that appointment had been made by any other party. (Applause.) Then he desired to say, as emphatically as he could, that a word would not escape him reflecting on the personal character of the noble lord whose appointment they condemned. (Hear, hear.) He believed that Lord Ripon, in his private and personal character, stood above all suspicion. In the third place, he desired to say, and with equal emphasis, that he was not there, and he should never by God's blessing appear anywhere, to offer violence to the glorious principle of the rights of conscience and civil freedom. He gave to every man the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, so long as that conscience did not trample upon the rights of other people's consciences. (Loud applause.) Now, the question must be put: After all, has Lord Ripon, as Viceroy of India,

any real influence as a Roman Catholic? Lord Ripon had influence—his appointment had direct influence and indirect influence. First of all, the appointment had direct influence. Would any man tell him that amongst the two hundred millions of people in a field, especially a missionary field, where controversy must of necessity be largely carried on, that there would not be points of difference that must be referred to the Viceroy? However excellent a Viceroy might be, and however anxious to be impartial, his subordinates would take their cue from him, and in spite of himself. (Cheers.) Secondly, the appointment had an indirect influence upon Roman Catholicism in the United Kingdom and throughout the world. Five and twenty years ago a friend of his, a gentleman, who if he had been now alive would be sitting in the House of Commons, one of the most consistent supporters of Her Majesty's Government, said to him, "They have nominated a Roman Catholic Recorder to the City of Derry, the first that has been proposed since the siege." We had now a Roman Catholic Lord Chancellor of Ireland. We had also Lord Kenmare appointed to a position of prominence; and the largest jewel in the gift of England's Queen, the highest and most important position in the British empire, was placed in the hands of a Roman Catholic. Briefly stating the reasons why he stood there emphatically and indignantly to protest against this appointment, Dr. White said, in the language and spirit of this resolution, it was subversive of the British Constitution, and the Law of Settlement, passed in the reign of William and Mary. The law of union between England and Scotland, the law of settlement between England and Ireland distinctly lay down these propositions:—"If the Queen or King of England shall become a Roman Catholic then, *ipso facto*, they lose their crown." (Loud cheers.) Next, "That their subjects are absolved thereby from their allegiance." And, thirdly, "That the succession to the Crown—the succession to the Crown by the very fact of their becoming Roman Catholics, devolves upon those who, being Protestants, would next have the succession to the sovereignty." Could any man make a part greater than the whole? Or could a master confer upon a subordinate powers and privileges which the master himself did not possess? If the Queen of England lost her crown, if her subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and if her next natural successors, being Protestants, by her becoming a Roman Catholic, succeeded to the throne, would this nation quietly and calmly allow the thin edge of the wedge to be driven in without consulting the people as represented by the legislature, and thus do that which even the Queen under heavy penalties dare not submit to Parliament? (Loud applause.) He said it deliberately, he cared not what were their politics or their party, that the Ministers of the Crown who proposed such a step ought to be impeached. (Cheers.) He protested against this act because it was in distinct and direct opposition to the recognized belief of all the Protestant Churches, without exception, in this country. The Protestant churches were five-sixths of the whole. What said the Church of England? That Roman Catholicism was a blasphemous, poisonous, and dangerous creed. The confession of faith of four millions of Presbyterians in the United Kingdom, subscribed to by men who were not found in our gaols, or in our workhouses, but men who constituted the very backbone of British power, and 5,000 ministers—yes 5,000 Presbyterian ministers in the United Kingdom—had solemnly and deliberately subscribed to that confession of faith which, in the 26th Article, declared the Pope of Rome to be anti-Christ. His third argument against the appointment of Lord Ripon was that it sacrificed the glorious and blessed results of the great Reformation. He would tell the man who made such an appointment as was now protested against—he cared not what was his eloquence or the weight of the party at his back—that he was playing a dangerous game if he trifled with our principles. What would Ridley and Latimer and old John Knox—what would Martin Luther have said—(loud cheers)—what would John Wesley—(cheers)—and what would Oliver Cromwell have said about this appointment? (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Why, they would have said what the greatest living preacher had written, and uttered the most indignant

protest against this outrage. He held it to be impossible for a Protestant country to enjoy civil and religious liberty if under the control of the Church of Rome as now constituted. The dogma promulgated in 1870 of Papal infallibility rendered liberty of opinion impossible, because it put a man in the stead of God. He could understand even a man who had always been a Roman Catholic leaving his Church when he was required to accept the dogma of Papal infallibility, Lord Ripon became a pervert after this promulgation, and therefore endorsed and held all the provisions of the Vatican Council. After the dogma became an article of faith, every vestige of liberty of opinion was abolished, and prevented even the possibility of Roman Catholics recognizing the exercise of one of the natural rights of man. He repeated that this appointment was an outrage upon the public feeling of the entire community. (Cheers.) There were 550 members of Parliament for England, Wales, and Scotland—alas! that there should be one Atheist amongst them—(cheers)—but there was not one Roman Catholic among them. We were told that there ought to be an Irish Roman Catholic Lord Chancellor because such a large number of the people of Ireland were Roman Catholics. Was that a reason for sending from England a Roman Catholic Viceroy of India? No, England would not tolerate such an outrage—when the Act of Settlement of the Royal succession became the statute law of England, it was thereby declared that the Sovereign reigning over this country must be a Protestant, and this meeting had been called together to protest against this invasion upon the liberty of the Protestant people of England. (Loud applause.)

The Rev. Joseph Bardsley (Rector of Stepney) said:—The *Times* in 1874 remarked that the statesman who became a Roman Catholic forfeited at once the confidence of the English people, and that such a step involved the complete forfeiture of his political influence. That was the opinion of the *Times* in 1874. Dr. White had substantiated the first clause of the resolution, that the appointment of Lord Ripon was inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the British Constitution. (Cheers.) He could show that it was dangerous to the stability of the Throne, and inimical to civil and religious liberty. (Cheers and counter cheers.) He objected in every way to a Roman Catholic being appointed Viceroy of India. Our forefathers, when they passed the Act of Settlement, had established the principle that the person who sits upon the Throne of England shall be a Protestant. When our present Sovereign was enthroned in Parliament she gave an affirmative answer to the declaration that she would, God being her helper, maintain inviolate the principles of the Protestant religion. Why did our forefathers feel it requisite to make that settlement? Lord Macaulay gives as the reason which led to the passing of the Act of Settlement, that two hundred years ago there was a strong conviction that a Roman Catholic thought himself free from all the rules of morality, and thought it meritorious to disregard those duties, and even the obligations of an oath, if by doing so he could avert injury to the Church of which he was a member. Roman Catholic casuists had written in defence of equivocation and mental reservation. Lord Macaulay had given those reasons why two of the most eminent men of that time had arrived at the conclusion that it was not safe to extend full toleration to Roman Catholics. Bishop Tillotson and Locke had both declared that it was safer to trust to Pagans representing civil authority than to trust to Roman Catholics. (Cheers.) Roman Catholics had also held that it was not requisite that they should keep faith with heretics. He would tolerate the faith of a Roman Catholic and of any other man, but he would not tolerate their interfering with the rights and privileges of their fellow-men. It has been said that Romanists will seek their objects by connivance. They will accept toleration, then try to get equality—that is the word—and when equality is obtained they will next insist upon superiority—(loud applause)—and they will never rest satisfied till they have effected the overthrow of the Protestant religion of a realm. In the words of the well-known proverb, "If you give them an inch they will take an ell; and if you give them a drop

they will drain your well." Lord Macaulay has shown that it is dangerous to allow a Roman Catholic to get into places of trust and authority. (Cheers.) I will quote one passage from Mr. Gladstone, who says that if we desire to dominate the mind of any church or community, we cannot do better than take the statements of the leading authorities in that community. We know it has been the teaching of Roman Catholic bishops who have taught their co-religionists were not required to keep faith, even if bound by solemn covenant, and are not to regard their oaths so far as heretics are concerned. That is what Pope Gregory IX. teaches, and he was no doubt quite as infallible as Pope Pius the Ninth. He found that Bailey distinctly declared that engagements that had been entered into and confirmed by the most solemn oaths must be violated for the utility of the Church, the honour of God, and for the good of society. He would just confirm that, for it might be said that those were merely speculative notions. Was it a speculative notion when an Emperor gave a solemn undertaking to John Huss, that if he appeared before the Council to defend himself or retract, whichever it might be, that he would protect him while there and on his return home? and then was given the vilest blow that ever stained the page of history—(cheers)—Huss being condemned and burnt on the spot, the act being defended by the declaration that the Emperor was not required to keep his word so long as it was an engagement to an heretic! (Cheers.) Another thing he would mention was the terrible bull the Pope issued against Henry VIII.; and, again, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, what was done? The Pope excommunicated her Majesty, and distinctly absolved all her subjects, whether they were magistrates or officials of any kind, from any oath of allegiance to her, and gave them liberty to set her at defiance and regard her as a person possessing no authority in the land. It might be said these were old statements. Quite right, but what was said by an eminent authority on the subject a few years ago? He said the Church of Rome and the Pope had restored, and now presented it all the old tools and weapons in the past to enforce them now. That authority declared distinctly, filling up that statement, that every convert—and therefore, of course, Lord Ripon—according to the requirements of the Pope, the late Pius IX., had to lay his loyalty at the feet of the Pope. Who was the authority from whom he quoted? Why Wm. Ewart Gladstone—(loud and continued cheers)—who went on to say on that subject that it was at the expense of his consistency if he was loyal. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) It was a very difficult and delicate question to settle, and would require the ability and talent of that eminent statesman to show whether Lord Ripon was consistent in his religion or not. (Hear, hear.) If he was consistent, then said Mr. Gladstone, he must place his loyalty and civil duty at the feet of the Pope. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) If he were not consistent, how could he be trusted with other matters? (Renewed cheers.) If Roman Catholics were at liberty, on the highest authority, to break all those solemn engagements where the interests of the Church required it—(No, no)—if they wanted a milder word he would say liberty to break all his engagements—he was afraid the Pope would go further and say he was bound to do it. (Cheers.) All he would say was that if Roman Catholics were at liberty to violate the most solemn contracts and engagements where the interests and utility of the Church required it—when the Pope claimed for himself the right to depose Sovereigns, and claimed that every human being should be subject to the Roman Pontiff, then, he maintained, their point was established.

Rev. Richard Roberts, of Liverpool, Wesleyan, proposed that the following memorial to her Majesty be adopted and signed by the Chairman on behalf of the meeting:—"To Her most Gracious Majesty Victoria, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of Faith, and Empress of India. The memorial of her Majesty's loyal and faithful subjects in public meeting assembled in London, on the 18th of June, 1880, humbly sheweth, that your Majesty's memorialists have observed with feelings of the deepest sorrow and alarm that a member of the Roman Catholic Church has been appointed your Majesty's representative in the Government of British India. That your Majesty's memorialists

humbly submit that your Majesty, as a Protestant Sovereign, cannot be rightly represented by a Roman Catholic in the Government of your Majesty's Indian dominions; and that such appointment, being inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the British Constitution—as fixed and determined by the Act of Settlement, by the Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland, and by the Roman Catholic Relief Act—is calculated to undermine the stability of the Throne. That inasmuch as certain tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, opposed to the teaching of God's Holy Word and solemnly renounced by your Majesty in the Coronation Oath and Declaration as 'superstitious and idolatrous,' are now professed by your Majesty's Viceroy in India, it is the earnest conviction of your memorialists that the sanction thus extended to the Roman Catholic religion will grievously discourage the Protestant missionaries labouring in India, seriously retard the progress of Christian education, and tend to bring down upon this Protestant kingdom the visitations of God's righteous displeasure. Your memorialists, therefore, humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take such steps as to your Majesty may seem meet for averting the injurious consequences apprehended by your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects. And your memorialists, as in duty bound, will ever pray." (Loud cheers.) Mr. Roberts said he would first give a quotation from the words of Pope Pius IX., which he was sure their Roman Catholic friends would listen to. (Cheers.) On June the 16th, 1871, addressing a number of English youths introduced by Lord Gainsborough, and headed by the son of his lordship, the Pope said, "That the church could never be handmaiden to the State—(hear, hear)—she must teach, direct, and govern the Christian world." Of course that was the Roman Catholic Church. (Cheers.) Then, speaking to the Austrians and Tyrolese, who waited upon his Holiness on the 18th June, 1871, he said, "At the same time I put you in mind that your obedience and fidelity must have limits—be faithful to the sovereign that God has given you. Obey the laws which govern you—but when it becomes necessary—your obedience and fidelity." There was a volume issued of his speeches made during his pontificate, and on the front page were the words, "let this divine volume of the angelical Pío Nono be recorded as from the hands of an angel." (Laughter.) He would continue the former quotation, "but when it becomes necessary, your obedience and fidelity must stop at the foot of the altar—for it must not be forgotten that besides obligations binding you as subjects, you have other duties, as Christians. Remember that above laws, constitutions, empires, is the divine law, and above the princes of earth is the sovereign law of Heaven." The title that has been assumed by the Popes of the earth has been this, "The principal of the kings of the earth." Taking to themselves the divine title, and subjecting all the powers of earth to their words and dominions and a man who held those sentiments, and entertained them as his sober religious convictions, was not fit to govern the largest portion of the Empire of Queen Victoria. (Loud and continued cheering.) Something had been said about equality. He believed in it. (Hear, hear.) But it must be equality of obedience as well as equality of privilege. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) If they had the privilege of British protection, they must also be obedient to British law. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He would give another Roman Catholic authority. The *Catholic Vindicator* said, "How does the Church (I mean the Roman Catholic Church, of course) regard Queen Victoria? Did not the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster—(cheers and hisses)—omit the prayer for the sovereign, which was only intended for a Catholic sovereign, at Southwark on Good Friday—for the simple and obvious reason that Queen Victoria is not a member of the Christian Church—of that Church which if we refused to hear and obey we are at once classed with heathens. They are the words of Almighty God, and hence Queen Victoria is only prayed for generally in the prayer for heretics and schismatics—"Oh"—with others. Let us then act as our holy mother the Church does in the matter, and while we have none but charitable feelings towards the Queen personally, most certainly wish her no greater harm

than that one day she may be received in the Christian Church—"Oh, oh,"—even though it be at the cost of her throne. ("Oh, oh.") Let us not forget, whatever her post of authority may be, it is as nothing, and less than nothing, compared with that of the figure of Christ." Then he would say he craved an equality of obedience; but would they obey the law? (A voice, "No.") Then what right had they to an equality? (Cheers.) He would quote a third Roman Catholic authority, the *Tablet*. It stated as follows:—"Is it to be said that the Roman Catholics of Ireland would not obey the law? We answer with the most perfect frankness that it has been said, and is to be said, and that it will be done; neither in England nor in Ireland will the Roman Catholics obey the law—that is the law of the Imperial Parliament. They have, or are likely to have before them, two things called laws, which unhappily contradict each other. Both cannot be obeyed, and both cannot be disobeyed. One of them is the law of God, and the other is no law at all. It pretends to be an Act of Parliament, but in legislation it has no more force of value than a solemn enactment that the moon is composed of green cheese. (Cheers.) It is not a law but a Parliamentary lie. Of these two things we need hardly say which will be obeyed and which disobeyed. The law of God—that is, the Pope's commands—will be, or rather has been, and is being carried into effect; the Parliamentary law will be spit upon." (Laughter.) He wanted to know why their friends demanded equality, and yet wanted obedience to the law which gave them that. Inasmuch as the Viceroy of India belonged to an opposite faith—a faith that refused to recognize the supremacy of the Queen in Church and State—it was impossible that he should represent fairly and properly a Protestant Queen. (Cheers.) It was suggested by the Prime Minister that the Viceroy of India would do no violence to Protestant susceptibilities owing to his religious conviction; but if Her Majesty was to be represented aright in the largest portion of her Empire, we did not want a divided allegiance, partly Popish and partly English. This reminded him of what was recorded in the Bible about the women who slept together with their children, and in the morning found one dead, and they went before Solomon to decide whose was the remaining child. Solomon settled the controversy by offering to divide it. The false mother agreed to this, but the true mother would have nothing but the whole child. (Great cheering.) So in this case. The Prime Minister seemed content with half—(laughter)—but they, as the representatives of the Queen and Constitution, demanded the whole—an undivided allegiance to Protestantism. (Loud cheers.)

Rev. Dr. Wainwright said he asked them to remember under what sort of Governors the Empire of India had grown, so to speak, from an acorn into an oak. He could not but feel that even if the Marquis of Ripon were as great as the Prime Minister of to-day declared him to be, if he were a fit and proper person, still there was no man in the country who was such a dallard as to dare to say that Lord Ripon was the most fit and proper person to fill that office. (Cheers.) The question before them was not a question of one Papist, but a question of Popery or no Popery. (Loud cheers.) That was the cataplasm, and the rising tide against which they must take precautions, and if they did not do it promptly they might find it too late. (Cheers.) Lord Ripon went to India, not to represent them, but to misrepresent them. (Loud cheers.) He went to misrepresent the sovereignty to which he had been in the first instance an alien. This sovereignty was of Queen Victoria, whom God had made prosperous, and who on this island was the symbol of all that Englishmen held most necessary for freedom of conscience, for the purity of home, for the stability of social order, and for the prosperity of the Empire. But in proportion to the magnificence of the superstructure was greatness of the foundation at the base. What was that foundation? Some of the persons present had no doubt seen that picture of the Queen of these realms giving a Bible to an African potentate—an African who had pondered over the civilisation of England, and who had wondered at our shipping and commerce, and who had thought of the proud boast, "I am an Englishman." (Cheers.) "What made it so?" Why, our freedom, represented by the Queen of these realms, who showed her mind on the subject when she



gave to the inquiring African prince the English Bible—(cheers)—saying the words: "There is the secret of England's greatness." (Loud applause, and waving of handkerchiefs.) Lord Ripon went to India, and England's greatness is built up on the Bible, which was God's greatest gift to happy England. Did Lord Ripon echo the Queen's words? When he spoke he misrepresented the opinions of the Queen and the opinions of the people—(hear, hear)—and he was in every sense the "wrong man in the place." But there was the other alternative. If, on the other hand, Lord Ripon took care to speak what he did not believe, then he was a hypocrite, and not fit to occupy the position he held. They all knew how John Wycliffe had fought for freedom. Where was the principle of equality in what Mr. Gladstone had done? The Queen of England sheltered freedom of conscience and of worship; but Lord Ripon said, because his Pope said it, and his Archbishop, and the Pope's predecessor, and every Catholic said it, "The whole Church is Ultramontane." That was Dr. Manning's declaration. And he also said, and so did Lord Ripon's Pope, "Freedom of conscience and of worship is insanity!" He (Dr. Wainwright) would not pursue this enumeration, but he would ask the audience if such things could be tolerated by Protestants? If these opinions were really held by the men he had referred to, then there was not a man in the room who could deny the truth of this—that Lord Ripon would either "hate the one and love the other," or he was not a follower of the Pope. There was no doubt which religion Lord Ripon would love, for he had taken up the manifesto, "I am a Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards." The Marquis of Ripon acknowledged that principle. Did those present know what that meant? Was that the man to represent British India? (No.) The *Times* itself had acknowledged the growth of Roman Catholicism in England. That organ showed its readers that for the past fifty years everything had gone to bring back Popery. That was what the *Times* said. The sending of the Marquis of Ripon to India had been previously intended and designed. (Hear, hear.) He did not mean to say that Mr. Gladstone had specially designed and planned the sending of Lord Ripon to India, but what he meant, and most earnestly, was this, that there were the mischievous unseen hands pulling the wires behind. (Hear, hear.) Had his hearers noticed how, when the late general election was going on, and the Liberals were found to be gaining a majority—(cheers and hooting)—had they noticed how there was a hitch in the proposal for filling the post of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland? He (the speaker) had noticed it. And the feeling at the time was represented in a certain journal, which made the surprising declaration that the Marquis of Ripon—failing other politicians whose names were mentioned—was fitted for the post. The editor of the journal he referred to made the following astounding statement:—"In this latter case (*i.e.*, the appointing of Lord Ripon) a short Act will have to be framed in order to enable the Marquis to hold the position." But those in power said, "No; it's all very well, the election is a sudden turn; but we do not forget there is a latent mass of Protestantism in the country, and we may be turned out as quickly as we turned in." And so it was said, "We can send him a long way off, we can send him to a region where there is reason to suppose there are not many of the Protestant faith, and the English people soon get accustomed to anything. (Cheers.) Then these politicians no doubt went on to say that it would be all right, that the feeling would tone down, and that Lord Ripon could ultimately be sent to Ireland; and if "bigots" objected they would take no notice, and would send a letter of apology—to the Marquis of Ripon. Since he (Dr. Wainwright) had been referring to the Prime Minister, he would now refer to the nobleman who had lately been Prime Minister. He would read a quotation of Lord Beaconsfield's—(renewed cheers)—and before reading it he would point out that the beginning of the probable ascendancy of Roman Catholicism was in the Catholic Emancipation Act. The Austrian Minister had said that the Jesuits were swarming in England, and that the effect would soon be felt, and Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington had also said that from certain ominous signs they believed the battle of

the Reformation would have to be fought over again. No man knew better than Lord Beaconsfield what had been taking place in this country in connection with Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Lord Beaconsfield said:—"No man can watch what has taken place in this country during the last ten years without being prepared, if he be of a thoughtful mind—I repeat the expression I used in my letter to Lord Dartmouth—that the crisis of England is fast approaching." The High Church Ritualists (these words were spoken in the House of Commons, and had never been challenged to this hour) and the Irish followers of the Pope have long been in secret combination, and are now in open confederation. I know the almost superhuman power of this combination. They have their hand almost on the realm of England, under the guise of Liberalism, and under the pretence of legislating for the spirit of the age. They are almost about to seize upon the supreme authority of the realm." If ever there was a political prophecy, that was one. (Cheers.) There was a Papist sent to disseminate Popery—and then he was to come back, and Ireland was to be governed under the shadow of the Pope, and, at the same time, under the Queen's sceptre. Was that the way England was to act when the highest authorities said a great crisis in our country was imminent? Could Englishmen view such a prospect with unconcern? He exhorted his hearers to do their utmost in the way of protesting against this most mischievous action of the Prime Minister in lending such aid to Roman Catholicism? The Roman Catholic religion did not allow of freedom. This was a Protestant country, and they were most wrongly misrepresented by a follower of the Pope being Viceroy of India. He hoped there would be such a feeling exhibited throughout the length and breadth of the land as would command the reversal of the action taken by the Government. Protestants felt they had been outraged. Earnest Protestants should remember what Roman Catholicism was in the past, and what it would be again in the future if it was allowed to gain the ascendancy. In a word, they must drive the Jesuits out of England. (Tumultuous cheering.)

Mr. Stewart moved—"That petitions embodying the foregoing resolutions be presented to both Houses of Parliament." He was very glad, coming from Scotland, to take part in that meeting. Although a great many of the supporters of Mr. Gladstone were returned from Scotland, he could assure them that Scotland was Protestant to the core. (Applause.) Mr. Gladstone had sold them, and he need not go back to Mid-Lothian again. (Cheers.)

Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.S.I., seconded the resolution.

Archdeacon Whately pronounced the benediction; and, after the singing of a verse of the National Anthem, the meeting separated.

## Is England to Remain a Protestant Kingdom?

Extract from Lord ELDON'S Speech (in the House of Lords) on the Third Reading of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 1829.

"I know that, sooner or later, this Bill will overthrow the Aristocracy and the Monarchy. . . . No sincere Roman Catholic could or did look for less than a Roman Catholic King and a Roman Catholic Parliament. Their lordships might flatter themselves that the dangers he anticipated were visionary, but . . . those with whom we are dealing are too wary to apprise you by any indiscreet conduct of the dangers to which you are exposed. When those 'dangers' shall have arrived, I shall have been consigned to the sepulchre, but that they will arrive I have no more doubt than that I

*now exist.* You hear the words of a man who will soon be called to his great account. I solemnly declare that I would rather not be alive to-morrow morning than, on waking, find that I had consented to a measure fraught with evils so deadly, and of which, had I not solemnly expressed this, my humble but firm conviction, I should have been acting the part of a traitor to my country, my Sovereign, and my God."

Lord Eldon's prophecy is already more an half fulfilled, and for the accomplishment of the remainder it only needs that we should (1) acquiesce in the appointment of a Roman Catholic Viceroy in India; (2) accept the Bill of which Mr. O'Shaughnessy has given notice, permitting the appointment of a Roman Catholic Viceroy in Ireland; and (3), as suggested by Mr. O'Donnell, abrogate the law which now excludes Papists from mounting the British Throne. But are Protestant Englishmen prepared to yield assent to this detestable programme? If not, it is high time that they should speak out.

## The Principles of Romanism,

IN REFERENCE TO THE RECENT POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS.

There are but too good reasons why Protestants and all lovers of civil and religious liberty should view with an uneasy mind the appointment of Romanists to high positions near the throne, and strenuously oppose it. In such opposition it is not persons who are opposed. These may be the worthiest of the worthy, and of the most estimable character. It is principles we contend against. It is a system which we oppose. Principles and a system which if not narrowly watched, and carefully kept in check, will assuredly subvert our constitution, deprive us of our valued liberty, and prove detrimental to the Protestant faith. The question is not a personal, but a national one. The interests involved are not merely individual, but also national. It behoves the country to be awake and watchful. It is not prudent to ignore, to be indifferent to, or to be ignorant of the principles and designs of Romanism. It is the veriest delusion to imagine that the principles of the Church of Rome are changed, or can change. Her assumed infallibility forbids it. If the Church of the 19th century repudiated as false, or refused to admit as being erroneous the Canons or Papal rescripts of the past, such denial would be the overthrow of the principle of infallibility. An encyclical letter of the Pope addressed to the Irish Bishops in 1882 proves this point, and shows that the Church of to-day is bound by the decrees of the past which were duly accepted. He says that "nothing of what has been regularly defined ought to be retrenched or changed, or increased; but that all should be preserved incorrupt,

both in meaning and expression. "Whatever has been enjoined in the past by papal decretal is binding at the present time. Dr. Troy in 1798 published a letter in which he affirmed that Catholics are obliged to submit to the decisions and decrees of the Pope; and Dr. Murray in 1825, stated before a committee of the House of Commons, that is the doctrine of every Catholic . . . and as the Church whether dispersed at large or assembled in its general councils, is infallible, its decisions are a rule of faith to which every Catholic is bound to submit." If now, we can ascertain what some of these decrees actually are, we shall see whether it be safe for a Protestant Kingdom to entrust the high official power to those who are bound to uphold these decrees, and whose loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another "must be placed, and whose allegiance to the Sovereign must be of a partial, divided nature." The Canon Law of Rome contains the Decrees of the Council of Trent, different Bulls issued by Popes from Sixtus IV. time, and a collection of the Bulls of Benedict XIV. This is the affirmation of a professor of Canon Law at Maynooth. It is with the latter that at present we have to deal. Amongst these there is one Bull called the *Bulla Cœne Domini*. This constitutes the Pope Supreme Governor of the World; excommunicates all Protestant princes; and all civil and ecclesiastical powers under them. One of the chief authorities on Canon Law, Reiffenstuel, thus speaks of this Bull and its obligation—"But the Bull *Cœne* is a most just law, as all concede. Therefore no acceptance of it is required for its obligation; consequently, it cannot be concluded by reason of non-acceptance of this Bull that it does not impose an obligation. . . . All persons everywhere, always and continually sin, if they do not accept it . . . the whole Bull in every part and in respect of all is most just and equitable. . . ." It prohibits those acts which are opposed and prejudicial to the most holy liberty, immunity, or jurisdiction of the Church, or to the Laws of the Roman Church, or to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the Pope." By this Bull Her Majesty is excommunicated. How, then, can a Romanist who believes in and is true to his Church bear unqualified and true allegiance to a Sovereign excommunicated by the decrees of an infallible Pope, and by the laws of an infallible Church? How can he refrain from advancing the cause and interest of his spiritual chief who claims to be the Vicar of Christ apart from whose Church salvation is impossible, rather than those of an heretical and excommunicate Monarch? To whom must loyalty be supremely shown—to the accursed ruler, or to the infallible representative of Christ on earth? But one reply can be made. To the latter; and his cause must come first. To hinder, oppose, or refrain from furthering it no conscientious follower of the Pope can, or even dare be guilty of. And the claim which he makes is distinctly of a temporal character. He claims to be supreme not alone in spiritual, but equally in temporal matters. Those who by reason of that obedience which is his due as Vicar of Christ, in spiritual concerns,

owe him due subjection, through these means, in temporal things. Those who own him as spiritual head must obey, or suffer the penalties due to disobedience. No station or position exempts from his authority. There is a Bull of Benedict which confirms this, and proves that the loyalty of Romanists must be given firstly to the Pope and for the advancement of his authority. This Bull confirms a Decree of Innocent XI. which was drawn up against those who dared to oppose the citations, mandates, and provisions of the tribunal of Rome. Its design was to enforce the same. This Bull says, "We ordain and define that all and every the governors, rulers, presidents of any places, territories and cities of a state not only immediately, but even mediately subject in temporals to the Apostolic see . . . ought to be comprehended and considered as comprehended in this same decree." It concludes :—"Therefore let no human being whatsoever infringe, or with rash audacity contravene this instrument of our confirmation, statute, decree, mandate, will and derogation, &c." (April 2. 1742). This Bull is obligatory on every Romanist, and its character is to substitute the Pope's temporal power for that of the Sovereign; whilst it requires that all papal behests be carried out by those who acknowledge the Pope's supremacy. Once again, let us hear another decree which is of authority, and is part of the Canon Law, and as such is bound to be received by the faithful. It is that of the Fourth Lateran Council. It reads—"We excommunicate and anathematise every heresy which exalteth itself against the holy orthodox and Catholic faith which we have set forth above: condemning all heretics by whatsoever names they may be reckoned who indeed have divers faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly. . . . But if any temporal lord be required and admonished by the Church shall neglect to cleanse his country of this heretical filth, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication, &c. There is no ambiguity here. Such as refuse to submit to the Pope are anathematized. Can the laws enacted by such persons be just laws? Can loyalty be fully accorded to those whom God in the person of the Pope has cursed? Can persons entrusted with power, under a Protestant Sovereign who are bound to acknowledge the right of Papal Supremacy, be trusted, or expected, to subordinate the Pope's Supremacy, to the Royal Supremacy, or to refrain from advancing the interests of the former even at the expense of the latter? If true to their principles, their Church, their faith, they will promote and make it their primary object to promote the papal cause. The interests of their Church with which the welfare of their souls is identified must have their very first care and consideration. It may be thought that the oath which binds to "true allegiance" to the Sovereign, and which affirms the denial of the right of papal jurisdiction in this country, is a sufficient guarantee for loyalty. No such thing. Provision is duly made for taking such oaths with a

safe conscience, and then discarding or violating them. The 16th Canon of the 3rd Lateran Council holds that "Oaths contrary to ecclesiastical utility are not to be accounted oaths, but perjuries." The good of the Church is a good end, as is affirmed, so that acts done with a good end are good acts. To take an oath for the good of the Church is a good act. If to violate it be for the same good it cannot be a bad act. The Roman moralists have provided a loop-hole for the sensitive conscience. Any oath may be taken with the secret reservation "saving the rights of my superiors," or of the Pope. But further, papal bishops have the power of dispensing subjects from the oath where the interests of the Church demand. The Bull *Pastor Bonus* grants this power to the Major Penitentiarius. He can absolve from "all sorts of oaths." Concerning the oath of allegiance which James I. for his own security drew up, Paschenius says—"If the Pope did dissolve the oath all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the King, or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. An unjust oath bindeth no man, but is ipso facto null."—Whether there be danger or not to the Constitution and country in yielding to Roman Catholic demands, and conceding to their political power, let one who lived and died a staunch member and priest of the Roman Church declare. Laurence Morrissey says—"The Pope must have the nomination and appointment of Roman Catholic monarchs of these realms. Ireland must be tributary to the Pope again. The Established Church must be Roman Catholic. All the heretics in the land must be exterminated and their properties confiscated, and the nation must be purged from heresy,—then, and then only will Roman Catholics consider themselves fully and unconditionally emancipated."

Trinity Parsonage, Runcorn.

W. PRESTON.

---



# CONTRIBUTIONS—CONTINUED.

Collected by Mr. T. O. Smith,  
continued

	\$	a.	d.
Baddock, H.	...	1	0
Batton, Miss	...	0	5
Balanco, Miss	...	0	10
Bacot, Dr.	...	0	5
Beach, J.	...	0	5
Barney, G.	...	0	5
Burrell, Mrs. T.	...	0	10
Brown, T.	...	0	5
Barnes, E. A.	...	0	5
Bentall, E.	...	0	5
Baldry, Rev. F.	...	0	10
Belt, C. J.	...	0	5
Blinstead, C.	...	0	10
Bayley, R.	...	0	5
Brock, Miss	...	0	5
Brookman, Miss	...	0	5
Brice, H.	...	0	5
Billing, Misses	...	1	0
Baddock, Mrs.	...	0	2
Belben, G.	...	0	5
Bird, E.	...	0	10
Bartlett, G. L.	...	0	5
Broadly, Rev. Mr.	...	0	2
Bull, Mrs.	...	0	5
Blagden, Mrs.	...	0	10
Bullitt, Dr. C.	...	2	0
Bullitt, Dr. J. C.	...	1	0
Bewen, C. T.	...	0	10
Brown, Misses	...	0	10
(Parl.)	...	0	5
Boulton, R. B.	...	0	2
Coombs, E.	...	0	5
Chambers & Richards	...	0	10
Crocker, A. E.	...	0	5
Churchill, Miss	...	0	5
Cosens, Mrs.	...	0	10
Cosens, Rev. E. H.	...	0	5
Corry, E.	...	1	0
Cox, Mrs.	...	0	2
Crawford, R.	...	0	2
Collings, W.	...	0	2
Cox, W.	...	0	2
Cockey, H.	...	0	5
Curtis, J.	...	0	5
Cooper, A.	...	0	5
Cox, Miss	...	0	1
Clarke, Miss	...	0	5
Drake, J. (2 years)	...	0	10
Devenish, R.	...	0	2
Dodge, A.	...	0	2
Dashwood, F.	...	0	2
Durden, H.	...	0	5
Dunham, J.	...	0	2
Dixon, W.	...	0	2
Durden, W.	...	0	5
Dalrymple, Mrs.	...	0	5
Dingley and Sons	...	0	2
Dick, W. B.	...	0	2
Davey, J.	...	0	2
De St. Dalmas, H.	...	0	2
De Mierro, Mrs.	...	0	5
Edmunds, C.	...	0	5
Eales, Miss	...	1	0
Edmonds, W.	...	0	10
Everett, J.	...	0	5
Edlin, Mrs.	...	0	7
Eisey, G.	...	0	5
Elliot, J. H.	...	1	0
Elton, E.	...	0	10
French, H.	...	0	10
Fowles, Lady M.	...	1	0
Friker, W. H.	...	0	2
Farquharson, Rev. R.	...	0	2
A.	...	0	2
Farris, J.	...	0	2
Fox, D. C.	...	0	10
Fougere, Dr.	...	0	10
Fennell, Mrs.	...	0	5

Collected by Mr. T. O. Smith,  
continued

	\$	a.	d.
Fry, J.	...	0	10
Foster, Misses	...	0	2
Garland, Rev. A. G.	...	0	10
Griffiths, C.	...	0	5
Gilbert, T.	...	0	10
Greenham, Misses	...	0	5
Grain, A.	...	0	5
Groves, Mrs.	...	0	2
Graves, Rev. H. A.	...	0	5
Gillson, W. H.	...	0	5
Gibson, J.	...	0	10
Greaves, Rev. T.	...	0	5
Girdlestone, Miss	...	0	10
Gundry, J. P. F.	...	0	10
Green, C.	...	1	0
Goodman	...	0	2
Hambly, Miss	...	1	0
Hambly, C. J.	...	0	10
Hockin, Rev. W.	...	0	5
Hockin, F.	...	0	5
Hodgson, W. H.	...	1	0
Hopperton, Miss	...	0	5
Heywood, Rev. H. T.	...	0	10
Hannafor, N.	...	0	2
Hesthote, Miss	...	0	10
Hadden, G. H.	...	0	5
Kine, A.	...	0	1
Higginson, Mrs.	...	0	5
Hawke, Miss M. M.	...	0	2
Harding, N.	...	0	2
Hobbs, J. J.	...	0	2
Hartgill, T. W.	...	0	2
Hoare, J.	...	0	2
Hounsell, W.	...	0	10
Holly, G.	...	0	2
Hogg, B. A.	...	0	2
Hawkins, T. H.	...	0	5
Hollyer, J. S.	...	0	2
Jennings, Rev. J. H.	...	0	5
Johnson, T.	...	0	10
Johnson, Rev. Pitt	...	0	5
Jordan, W. R. H.	...	0	5
Jenkins, T. J.	...	0	2
James, The Misses	...	1	0
Jacobs, T.	...	0	5
Jones, Heard and	...	0	5
Lagran	...	0	5
Key, Commander	...	0	10
Kingsbury, J.	...	0	10
Lankar, Rev. W.	...	0	5
Longmire, Miss	...	0	5
Lawrence, J. G. H.	...	0	2
Lindsay, J.	...	0	2
Lush, J.	...	0	10
Lyon, Rev. W. H.	...	0	5
Langley, Major-Gen.	...	1	0
Lush, Dr.	...	0	5
Lambert, Mrs.	...	0	5
Lee, C. M.	...	0	10
Lake, Dr. W. C.	...	0	2
Lee, Miss E.	...	0	5
Levin, Miss	...	0	2
Lundie, C.	...	0	5
Mullett, T.	...	0	2
Miller, Mrs.	...	0	2
Merced, G. T.	...	0	10
Morgan, E. M.	...	0	2
Maddock, Rev. P. B.	...	0	5
Meadley, Mrs.	...	0	3
Milroy, J.	...	0	5
May, J. E.	...	0	10
McKellar, Mrs.	...	0	5
Metzger, Rev. J.	...	0	5
Mien, W.	...	0	5
Moore, Miss	...	0	10
Martin, Lt.-Col. W. J.	...	1	0
Maynard, A. & W.	...	0	10
Mather, Mrs.	...	0	10

Collected by Mr. T. O. Smith,  
continued

	\$	a.	d.
Nunn, Dr.	...	1	1
Nunn, E. C.	...	1	0
Niven, Rev. W.	...	1	0
Pholot, E.	...	0	10
Prince, H.	...	0	10
Pinehard, W. P.	...	0	5
Park, T. M.	...	0	10
Picard, Dr.	...	0	10
Pain, Mrs.	...	0	10
Powell, T.	...	0	5
Palmer, Capt. G. G.	...	0	5
Phelp, Miss	...	0	2
Pratt, Rev. Canon	...	0	10
Peddybridge, E.	...	0	10
Pearce, Miss	...	0	10
Pearce, Dr. E.	...	0	2
Pearman, H.	...	0	2
Price, R. F.	...	0	5
Rawlinson, W.	...	0	10
Roxburgh, Dr.	...	0	5
Roberts, Mrs.	...	0	10
Roberts, W.	...	0	2
Reid, R.	...	0	5
Russell, J. R.	...	0	5
Rose, G.	...	0	5
Samson, G.	...	0	2
Slade, Miss	...	0	2
Spink, Miss	...	0	5
Sparks, W.	...	0	10
Summers, G.	...	0	2
Steele, E.	...	0	5
Simper, Mrs. E.	...	0	10
Sims, Joseph	...	0	10
Snell, F.	...	0	5
Stoneham, Dr.	...	0	5
Stoll, Mrs.	...	1	0
Square, Dr. W. J.	...	0	5
Stribley, E.	...	0	5
Smyth, W.	...	0	5
Shley, Mr. and Mrs.	...	2	0
Slater, Rev. W. P.	...	0	10
Story, Mrs.	...	0	10
Scott, Rev. T. S.	...	0	5
Stone, Miss	...	1	0
Smith, Rev. R.	...	0	5
Stradling, A. J.	...	0	2
Trehane, Miss	...	0	2
Tucker, Miss F.	...	0	2
Tate, Gen. C.	...	1	0
Turnbull, H. E.	...	1	0
Thomas, E.	...	0	5
Townsend, Rev. H.	...	0	10
Townsend, W.	...	0	2
Townsend, J.	...	0	5
Tadd, Mrs.	...	0	2
Tulloch, Miss	...	0	10
Thomas, R.	...	0	5
Veysey, H.	...	0	10
Vickers, T. H.	...	0	5
Victor, J.	...	0	5
Vye, J. W.	...	0	5
Wicker, E.	...	0	10
Whitham, S. W.	...	0	10
Way, W. A.	...	0	10
White, J.	...	0	5
Williams, Dr.	...	0	2
Wigram, Rev. F. R.	...	0	10
Wilkinson, Rev. S.	...	0	5
Wesleyan College	...	2	0
Tramton	...	0	5
Wesford, G. B.	...	0	5
Wadman, Mrs.	...	0	2
Webb, Dr. J. J.	...	0	5
Welch, J.	...	0	5
White, G. G.	...	0	10
Whipple, H. H.	...	1	0
Weston, C.	...	0	10
Williams, J. & Sons	...	0	5

# CONTRIBUTIONS—CONTINUED.

Collected by Mr. T. O. Smith,  
continued— £ s. d.  
Ware, E. ... 0 5 0  
Young, Mrs. G. L. ... 0 2 6

Collected by Mr. G. Thomson:—  
Atkey, C. J. ... 0 10 0  
A. Friend ... 0 5 0  
Allen, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Austin, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Austin, Mrs., Par. Fd. ... 0 2 6  
Adams, J. ... 0 10 0  
Bird, E. W. ... 0 10 0  
Brigstocke, Mrs. ... 0 10 6  
Bradford, S. ... 0 5 0  
Brodie, Miss L. ... 0 10 0  
Ballard, A. ... 0 10 0  
Rush, Rev. T. W. ... 0 2 6  
Bathurst, Rev. W. A. ... 0 5 0  
Borrowman, J. ... 0 5 0  
Biggs, J. ... 0 5 0  
Biggs, Col. ... 0 2 6  
Budgett, W. H. ... 0 10 0  
Bastick, S. ... 0 10 0  
Bowron, Dr. ... 0 10 0  
Baxter, Rev. A. J. ... 0 2 0  
Bradley, Misses ... 2 2 0  
Blaker, M. S. ... 0 5 0  
Brooke, Mrs. ... 0 10 0  
Carr, Miss ... 10 0 0  
Carr, Miss S. S. ... 0 10 0  
Cruse, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Carpenter, W. ... 0 10 0  
Card, H. ... 0 5 0  
Cruse, Rev. F. ... 0 5 0  
Cavill, Rev. G. ... 0 10 6  
Clark, Rev. T. H. ... 0 5 0  
Cuff, R. C. ... 1 0 0  
Clement, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Challicombe, Dr. ... 0 10 0  
Clymer, Mr. ... 0 2 0  
Clayton, Rev. Canon ... 2 2 0  
Chater, Mrs. ... 0 10 0  
Cornabe, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Dando, C. T. ... 0 10 0  
Duke, W. ... 0 5 0  
Dagg, J. ... 1 0 0  
Drutt, M. ... 0 10 0  
E. M. ... 0 5 0  
Exley, J. ... 0 5 0  
Evans, D. P. ... 0 10 0  
Evans, J. L. ... 1 0 0  
Feddén, W. J. ... 0 10 0  
Fripp, Mrs. ... 1 1 0  
Fayle, Mrs. ... 1 1 0  
Fox, Douglas ... 1 0 0  
Frewer, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Friend, B. D. ... 0 10 0

Collected by Mr. G. Thomson,  
continued— £ s. d.  
F. C. S. ... 1 1 0  
Fry, J. S. ... 0 10 0  
Fisk, Mrs. ... 1 0 0  
Greene, T. ... 0 10 0  
Grace, H. ... 0 5 0  
Gould and Barn, Misses ... 1 1 0  
Grant, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Gray, T. ... 0 10 0  
Gray, T. W. ... 0 5 0  
Green, J. ... 0 5 0  
Gulliver, J. ... 0 2 6  
Gilbert, D. ... 1 1 0  
Gorrington, J. ... 1 1 0  
Graham, T. G. ... 3 0 0  
Hill, Mrs. ... don. 4 0 0  
Hill, C. S. ... 1 0 0  
Hannington S. & Son ... 1 1 0  
Henty, W. ... 1 1 0  
Hornbuckle, Miss ... 0 2 6  
Heywood, Misses ... 2 3 0  
Heywood, Rev. N. ... 0 10 6  
Hawkins, Mrs. ... 0 10 0  
Hunt, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Hooper, Miss ... 1 1 0  
Hall, Misses ... 0 5 0  
Highett, Dr. C. ... 1 1 0  
Highett, Dr. C., Par. Fd. ... 1 1 0  
Hathaway, Rev. E. F. ... 0 5 0  
Inall, W. ... 0 10 6  
Inskip, J. ... 1 1 0  
Jackson, Miss ... 1 1 0  
James, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Jones, W. C. ... 1 1 0  
Jardine, Dr. ... 1 1 0  
Jenvey, G. ... 0 5 0  
Jennings, Miss ... 0 2 6  
Jennings, Miss E. ... 0 2 6  
King, G. W. ... 0 10 0  
Kedell, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Lalsley, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Lee, W. R. ... 1 1 0  
Long, Miss ... 1 0 0  
Lee, Miss ... 0 2 6  
Lloyd, J. ... 0 10 6  
Lutman, J. ... 0 10 6  
Lardy, Mrs. Col. ... 1 0 0  
Matwin, Rev. B. ... 0 2 6  
Merrick, G. M. ... 0 2 0  
Morris, E. ... 0 10 0  
March, Miss ... 1 0 0  
Marrick, Wm. ... 1 1 0  
Moses, Dr. ... 0 10 0  
Malthus, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Mitchell, C. ... 0 10 6  
Newlyn, N. S. ... 0 2 0  
Newman, Mrs. ... 0 1 0

Collected by Mr. G. Thomson,  
continued— £ s. d.  
Newton, Mrs. ... 1 0 0  
Newland, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Newland, Miss, don. ... 0 2 0  
Newbolt, Lieut.-Col. ... 1 0 0  
Olding, W. ... 0 10 0  
Penny, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Phillips, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Pounder, Major ... 1 0 0  
Pre, Miss H. ... 0 2 6  
Plumer, A. S. ... 0 10 6  
Penruddock, Misses ... 2 0 0  
Penruddock, Misses  
donation ... 1 0 0  
Phipps, Mrs. ... 1 1 0  
Pitman, Rev. J. ... 0 10 0  
Pannett, W. ... 0 2 6  
Parsons, C. ... 0 5 0  
Poynder, Rev. R. ... 1 1 0  
Reeves, E. ... 0 10 0  
Ray, C. ... 0 2 6  
Robinson, Rev. W. W. ... 0 5 0  
Rumsay, Mrs. ... 0 2 6  
Sanders, Miss ... 2 0 0  
Saunders, Misses ... 1 1 0  
Smyth, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Sharp, R. D. ... 0 5 0  
Small, E. ... 0 5 0  
Street, J. ... 0 10 0  
Stocker, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Sayers, J. ... 0 5 0  
Shepherd, Mrs. ... 1 1 0  
Smith, Miss ... 0 2 6  
Spencer, Miss ... 1 1 0  
Sealey, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Straton, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Stewart, Miss ... 0 10 0  
Small sums ... 1 0 0  
Saville, Col. ... 1 1 0  
S. W. F. ... 1 0 0  
Taru, T. ... 0 5 0  
Tate, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Tucker, Rev. C. ... 2 2 0  
Turnbull, M. ... 0 2 0  
Thatcher, G. ... 0 10 0  
Uall, Rev. J. F. ... 0 10 0  
Woodward, Mrs. ... 0 5 0  
Wyatt, E. ... 0 10 0  
Wakefield, Mrs. ... 0 10 0  
Whitwell, M. ... 1 1 0  
Woolcombe, Miss ... 0 5 0  
Wilson, Mrs. G. Les ... 1 0 0  
Wheeler, R. ... 0 10 0  
Walker, Miss ... 1 1 0  
Way, Major ... 2 0 0  
Wheeler, H. ... 0 2 6

Subscribers of Ten Shillings and Sixpence are entitled to receive Reports, the Quarterly Magazine, the *Armoury* and other papers.

Subscriptions and Donations earnestly solicited, to be remitted to the Secretary, the Rev. G. R. BADENOCH, LL.D., 38, Parliament-street, London, S.W. P.O. Orders payable at Parliament-street, S.W. Bankers, Messrs. Herries, Farquhar, and Co., 16, St. James-street, S.W.